

Amendments to the Drawings:

The reference character of the clocked comparator in Fig. 41 has been changed to 4110 and the baseband circuitry is changed to 4112 as suggested by the Action.

REMARKS

Objection to the Drawings:

Paragraph 1 of the Action objects to the drawings because the clocked comparator in Fig. 41 should be numbered 4110 and the baseband circuitry should be numbered 4112. As discussed in the Amendments to the Drawings above, a replacement sheet has been included with this submission. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

Objections to the Specification:

Paragraph 2 of the Action objects to the specification because of the following informalities: “the output if comparator 4110” in line 7 of paragraph 0223 should be changed to - -- the output of comparator 4110 ---. Applicant has amended paragraph 0223 in the Amendments to the Specification above as suggested by the Action. Applicant, therefore respectfully requests that the objection to paragraph 0223 be withdrawn.

Paragraph 3 of the Action objects to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject mater. The Action states that the “specification never teaches that the combiner is passive as recited in claims 28 and 34.” The Applicant would like to draw the Examiner’s attention to figure 36 and paragraph 0214, which reads in part “[i]n such embodiments, [the] combiners...can be passive combiners such as the one illustrated in figure 36.”

Paragraphs 00209 and 00214 have been changed to correct a typographical error. The combiners 3320 and 3322 have been changed to combiners 3330 and 3332. No new matter has

been added since figure 33 shows two combiners 3330 and 3332, as would be understood by one of skill in the art.

Claim Objections:

Paragraph 4 of the Action objects to the claims 9-12 and 25-36 because of several informalities. Claims 29 and 35 have been canceled. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection as to claims 29 and 35 be withdrawn. Claims 9-12, 25 and 31 have been amended to improve clarity as suggested by the Action. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection as to claims 9-12, 25 and 31 be withdrawn. It appears to the Applicant that claims 26-28, 30, 32-34 and 36 are objected to because each depends from one of the claims 9-12, 25 and 31 discussed above. Since claims 9-12, 25 and 31 have been amended Applicant respectfully requests that the objection as to claims 26-28, 30, 32-34 and 36 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Paragraph 6 of the Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Action states that “[t]here is insufficient antecedent basis for [‘the analog-to-digital converter’] in line 2” of claim 17. The Applicant has amended claim 17 to depend from claim 10, as suggested in the Action. Applicant respectfully asserts that “analog-to-digital converter” now has sufficient antecedent basis. Additionally, the Applicant has amended claim 17 to correct the typographical error pointed out in the Action and therefore, the scope of claim 17 is no longer indefinite. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection as to claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Paragraph 6 of the Action rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiller (US 4,632,124). Claim 6 has been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot as to claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection as to claim 6. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in cancelled claim 6 at a later time. With respect to the remaining claim, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

Applicant has amended claim 1 in the above amendments to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 7. Paragraph 15 of the Action states that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is allowable since it contains all of the limitations of allowable claim 7 including the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 1 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 1 at a later time.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Paragraph 10 of the Action rejects claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hiller in further view of Beigel (US 5,235,326). Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 2-5 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claims 2-5 at a later time.

Paragraph 11 of the Action rejects claims 8, 13, 15-21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hiller in further view of Hwang (US 6,142,946). Claims 13, 18-21 and 24 have been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot as to claims 13, 18-21 and 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 13, 18-21 and 24. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in cancelled claims 13, 18-21 and 24 at a later time. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

Applicant has amended claim 8 in the above amendments to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 14. Paragraph 15 of the Action states that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 8 is allowable since it contains all of the limitations of allowable claim 14 including the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 8 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 8 at a later time. Claims 15-17 ultimately depend from claim 8, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 15-17 be withdrawn.

Paragraph 12 of the Action rejects claims 9-12, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hiller in further view of Hwang and Beigel (US 5,235,326). Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot as to claims 22 and 23. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 22 and 23. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in cancelled claims 22 and 23 at a later time. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

Claims 9-12 ultimately depend from claim 8, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 9-12 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claims 9-12 at a later time.

Paragraph 13 of the Action rejects claims 25-27, 31-33, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hickling (US 6,748,025) in further view of Huff (US 6,833,767). Claims 37 and 38 have been canceled thereby rendering this rejection moot as to claims 37 and 38. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 37 and 38. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in cancelled claims 37 and 38 at a later time. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

Applicant has amended claim 25 in the above amendments to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 29. Paragraph 15 of the Action states that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 25 is allowable since it contains all of the limitations of allowable claim 29 including the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 25 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 25 at a later time. Claims 26 and 27 ultimately depend from claim 25, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 26 and 27 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claims 26 and 27 at a later time.

Applicant has amended claim 31 in the above amendments to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 35. Paragraph 15 of the Action states that claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 31 is allowable since it contains all of the limitations of allowable claim 35 including the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 31 be withdrawn.

Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 31 at a later time. Claims 32 and 33 ultimately depend from claim 31, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 32 and 33 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claims 32 and 33 at a later time.

Paragraph 14 of the Action rejects claims 28 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Hickling in further view of Huff and Roo (US 6,459,246). Claim 28 ultimately depends from claim 25, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 28 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 28 at a later time. Claim 34 ultimately depends from claim 31, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 34 be withdrawn. Applicant, expressly reserves the right to pursue any patentable subject matter in original claim 34 at a later time.

The Applicant acknowledges that in paragraph 15 of the Action the Examiner has indicated that claims 7, 14, 29, 30, 35 and 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, claim 1 has been rewritten to include all of the limitations of claim 7, claim 8 has been

rewritten to include all of the limitations of claim 14, claim 25 has been rewritten to include all of the limitations of claim 29, and claim 31 has been rewritten to include all of the limitations of claim 35. Consequently, claims 7, 14, 29 and 35 have been canceled. As indicated by paragraph 15 of the action claims 1, 8, 25, and 31 should be allowable since they have been amended as discussed above. Further, claims 30 and 36 have been amended to depend from allowable claims 25 and 31 respectively. Applicant respectfully asserts that the application should be in condition for allowance for all of these reasons stated above.

United States Patent Application Publication (US Pub. 2005/0152475 A1):

The applicant would like to make the examiner aware that the Patent Application Publication for this case does not include the correct figures. Specifically, figures 32-34 in the published application are incorrect and figures 35-42 are missing. The Applicant is concerned that any patent that may issue from this application may be similarly in error if the figures are not corrected to match the figures filed in this case. Applicant respectfully requests that this error be corrected on any patent that issues from this application.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that given the above amendments and remarks, the claims are now in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested. No new claim fees are believed to be necessitated by this response. The Examiner is requested to charge any additional fees that may due with this response to deposit account 13-0480.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2005

By: 

Noel C. Gillespie
Reg. No. 47,596
Baker & McKenzie
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 2300
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone (619) 235-7753
Facsimile (214) 978-3099